

FOREWORD

The Council of the Pali Text Society hope to continue publication of the *Journal*, if support and interest are sufficient.

The *Journal* will publish short Pali texts, translations, and commentaries on texts, catalogues and handlists of Pali books and manuscripts, and similar material.

Papers should be sent to the editor:

Mr K. R. Norman,
Faculty of Oriental Studies,
Sidgwick Avenue,
Cambridge, CB3 9DA.

TWO JĀTAKA MANUSCRIPTS FROM THE NATIONAL LIBRARY IN BANGKOK

Although the describing of Pāli manuscripts has a fairly long history, starting with Westergaard's catalogue¹ of the manuscripts in Copenhagen, even the knowledge of collections of Pāli manuscripts kept in European libraries and museums is far from being comprehensive. A number of lists and short descriptions have appeared in earlier numbers of this *Journal*.² As far as British collections are concerned, a new catalogue of Sinhalese manuscripts in the India Office Library has appeared,³ and another describing the Neville Collection in the British Museum is in preparation.⁴ Further information about older catalogues and unpublished handlists may be found in the *Pāli Buddhist Review*.⁵

In France, the catalogue of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris is under revision, and a short supplement to Cabaton's catalogue⁶ has been published recently by Jacqueline Filliozat.⁷ The same scholar has also collected further information⁸ about Pāli manuscripts, mostly of later texts, kept in the same library.

The rich collection of Pāli manuscripts in Denmark has been described by G. Cœdès⁹ and C. E. Godakumbara¹⁰ in Volumes 2,2 and 1, respectively, of the *Catalogue of Oriental Manuscripts, Xylographs etc. in Danish Collections*. Volume 2,1 dealing with Cambodian and Burmese Pāli manuscripts is under preparation.¹¹

C. Regamey has given information¹² about a Swiss collection containing mainly Pāli manuscripts, while German collections are in the process of being catalogued in various volumes of the monumental *Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland [Inventory of Oriental Manuscripts in Germany]* founded by W. Voigt (1911–1982).¹³

As far as Asia is concerned, the only Indian collection described so far seems to be that in the Adyar Library.¹⁴ In those countries where Theravāda Buddhism prevails, there is a good catalogue of the Colombo Museum¹⁵ which, however,

includes only about two thirds of the collection. Libraries of monasteries in Sri Lanka have been surveyed by K. D. Somadasa.¹⁶ Further information about earlier attempts to catalogue Pāli manuscripts in Ceylon and Burma may be found in the rich and comprehensive bibliographies made by H. Bechert.¹⁷ As far as Thailand, Laos and Cambodia are concerned, there is a list by P.-B. Lafont,¹⁸ which supplements the still valuable article by L. Finot.¹⁹ The Cambodian monastery libraries may be considered as destroyed and their manuscripts as lost.

Although hardly noticed outside the kingdom, important and efficient steps have been taken to take stock of the Pāli manuscripts in Thailand. Rich collections which sometimes contain rather old Pāli manuscripts can be found today in the monasteries of North Thailand. Mostly, however, they contain manuscripts written in the North Thai (Thai Yuan or Lanna) language. Consequently, a survey started by the Social Research Institute of the University of Chiang Mai, at present under the directorship of Professor Kasem Burakasikorn, has concentrated on collecting North Thai literature. Fortunately, old and, as far as can be judged from a brief inspection, valuable Pāli manuscripts have not been excluded from the survey. The first fruit of this endeavour was a mimeographed survey by Sommai Premchit in collaboration with Puangkam Tuikeo.²⁰ In the meantime a project has been started by the same institute to microfilm these manuscripts, at present under the supervision of Acharn Balee Buddharaksha, who has given a first survey of the manuscripts available in microfilm.²¹ Both lists are written in Thai.

Comparatively little is known about the earlier history of books in Thailand prior to the late 18th century. Some outlines, together with information about two old manuscripts of the *Samyuttanikāya*, have been given by the present writer.²² In Central Thailand, the advent of the Chakri Dynasty, which has ruled the country since BE 2325 (1782), marks also the start of a remarkable series of editions of the *Tipiṭaka*, the best known of which is that printed by order of

Rama V Chulalongkorn in 1893, expanded in 1927, and reprinted in 1980.²³

Editorial activities preceding the Rāma V edition have been described by G. Coedès,²⁴ who at the same time furnishes some information about the manuscripts and other collections of the Vajirināna National Library.²⁵ Among other items Coedès mentions an extremely old manuscript of the *Sāratthapakāsinī*, written in BE 1938, corresponding to AD 1440. This seems to be the second oldest dated Pāli manuscript known, being only slightly younger than the Samuttanikāya manuscript of AD 1412 kept in the Colombo Museum.²⁶

Although there is an old, very brief and extremely rare printed list of titles of manuscripts kept in the National Library, which is not accessible to me, it is somewhat difficult to find out the exact contents of this highly valuable collection while the catalogue is still under preparation. There are some brief handlists, which are useful but accessible only with difficulty.

To get a clearer picture of this collection, I started to inspect older manuscripts written during the Ayuthaya period before 1767 during three visits to Thailand in the years 1981, 1982 and 1983, which have been supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft. Besides that foundation I have to thank the director of the National Library, Acharn Kullasap Gesmankit, and her ever helpful staff for granting access to this collection which proved to be of unexpected interest and importance for Pāli studies.

In the following pages two of the Jātaka manuscripts read during my visit to the National Library in 1983 will be described.

I. KHUDDAKANIKĀYA JĀTAKAPĀLI. Library no. 6284 (old number 126–5/6); 13 fasc.; dated Buddha Sakkarāja 2249 = AD 1706. Khmer script. According to a modern palm-leaf used as the cover there should be 15 fasciculi (*phūk*), as is also stated in a hand list. However, only 13 *phūk* actually survive.

Both sides of the manuscript, which has been put between wooden covers, have been painted with black lacquer, on which there is a golden pattern. Together with the pagination this pattern proved to be helpful when rearranging the *phūk* in their correct sequence. At the same time the pattern of the *phūk* containing the Mahājanaka-Jātaka provides a further clue that it has been added here from somewhere else to supplement our fragmentary manuscript.

It is important to notice that the lacquer and the pattern have been applied only after both parts of the manuscript written during AD 1697 and 1706 had been reassembled.

Further the pagination seems to indicate that an incomplete copy has been supplemented after an interval of nine years. Starting from the nucleus [6. Bhūridatta (*phūk* 2), pages *so-ai*, 7. Candakumāra, pages *o-gu*, 8. Brahmanārada, pages *gyu-cah*] it seems that 8. *Vidhura*, pages *chya-ña*, has been added at the end, and 6. Bhūridatta (*phūk* 1), pages *la-sai*, at the beginning of the fragment. Only the pagination of 5. Mahosatha poses some difficulties. The last two *phūk*, 4 pages *pū-bham* and 5 pages *ma-rah*, are consistent with the following *phūk* of Bhūridatta. The stray pagination of Mahosatha *phūk* 1 pages *dī-nau*, *phūk* 2 pages *ta-dai*, and *phūk* 3 pages *ca-jau*, is difficult to explain. In theory one might assume that the missing second *phūk* of Vidhura had been numbered as pages *ñā-dī*, and that the scribe inadvertently continued this pagination, if he started to copy the Mahosatha *phūk* 1 only after finishing Vidhura *phūk* 2. This, however does not explain the pagination of Mahosatha *phūk* 2 pages *ta-dai* and *phūk* 3 pages *ca-jau*. The following assumption would account for the strange pagination at least to a certain extent. If more than one scribe worked at supplementing a fragmentary manuscript, one of them might have started from the beginning with the Suvaṇṇasāma pages *ka-ge* and the Nimi pages *gai-ju*, and then, leaving Mahosatha *phūk* 1 to the second scribe, continued with Mahosatha *phūk* 2, for which he calculated roughly, and not altogether wrongly, page *ta* as the first one. The confusion was then created by the second scribe, who continued the Vidhura pagination using pages *dī-nau* instead of pages *jū* foll. Even if

this inferred procedure is the correct one, it is difficult to see why Mahosatha *phūk* 3 has the pages *ca-jau*.

There is still one more problem posed by the pagination. Starting from the first page of Mahosatha *phūk* 4, which is page *pū*, and calculating backwards, there should have been seven *phūk* before this one in the manuscript, whereas there are only five extant. As the Suvaṇṇasāma is the third *jātaka* in the *mahānipāta*, two *phūk* are left for the Mūgapakka (Temiya) and Mahājanaka. That both were once included in this manuscript is shown again by the golden pattern, which clearly points to missing parts before the first extant *jātaka*, the Suvaṇṇasāma, which therefore should not start with page *ka*.

Contents of the manuscript:

[1.] BRA MAHĀJANAKA, *phūk* 1, no date.

Leaves: *ka-ghī*

Beginning: *koyam majhe . . . : Ja VI 30,15 = B VI 39,1*
End: . . . *ānando sesaparisā buddhaparisā ahesum. simbalī . . . mahārājakulā ahesum . . . aham evā ti sammāsambuddho ahositi. mahājanakajātakam nitthitam: Ja VI 68,23 = B VI 84,6*

Remarks: Written by a different hand and showing a different pattern on both sides of the 'inner book', this *phūk* has most probably been taken from a second manuscript to supplement the fragment. It has been corrected by two hands.

3. SUVANNAŚĀMAJĀTAKAM, *phūk* 1, dated BS 2249 *pī cō* 'year of the dog'; according to Sao Saimöng ('Cūla Sakkarāja and the sixty cyclical year names', *Journal of the Siam Society* 69, 1981, pp. 4–12) BS 2249 corresponding to CS 1068 a *rāy-sed* or dog year, *cō* being used in Thai to designate the 11th cyclical (dog) year.

Leaves: *ka-ge*, plus one leaf without pagination at the end of this *phūk*. This leaf is covered by writing only in a middle column, recto, and is otherwise blank.

Beginning: *ko nu mam . . . : Ja VI 68,25 = B VI 85,1*

End: . . . *suvannapandito pana aham evā ti sammāsambuddho*

ti. suvannasāmajātakam niṭṭhitam tatiyam buddham saranam gacchāmi sam: Ja VI 95,11 = B VI 117, 15

Remarks: The formula at the end of a *phūk* very often breaks off in the middle of the word just as the space allows.

A new edition of this *jātaka* has been prepared by R. Čičak-Chand (*Das Sāmajātaka. Kritische Ausgabe, Übersetzung und vergleichende Studie*. Bonn 1974 (thesis), cf. M. Hahn; 'Die Haribhaṭṭajātakamālā (II). Das Śyāmajātaka', *WZKS* 20, 1976, pp. 37–74).

4. NEMIRĀJAJĀTAKA, *phūk* 4, dated BS 2249 = 1706.

Leaves: *gai-ju* pagination *gha-ghaḥ* is missing by mistake, no gap in the text.

Beginning: *accheram vata . . .* : Ja VI 95,13 = B VI 119,1

End: *nemijātakam catuttham niṭṭhitam. nibbānapaccayo hotu me anāgate*: Ja VI 129,17 = B VI 162,10

Remarks: There are many corrections of the text and notes in the margin by a second hand.

5a. MAHOSATHAPĀṇḍITAJĀTAKA, *phūk* 1, dated BS 2249 = 1706.

Leaves: *dī-nau*

Beginning: *pañcālo sabbasenāyā ti . . .* : Ja VI 329,20 = B VI 173,1

End: *sirikālakīṇīpañho niṭṭhito*: Ja VI 349,18 = B VI 188,16

Remarks: There are corrections by a second hand, probably by the same hand as found in the Mahājanaka. Interlinear or marginal notes, however, are missing.

The name Mahosadha (our manuscript has Mahosatha throughout) is current in SE Asia instead of Mahāummagga(B and S ummaṅga)-Jātaka, though the name has been dropped and replaced by Mahāummanga in B. In S 2523 = 1980, on the other hand, the traditional name has been kept. On the names and the sequence of the *jātakas* in SE Asia see G. H. Luce ('The 550 Jātakas in Old Burma', *Artibus Asiae* 19,1956, pp. 291–307) and G. Martini ('Les titres des Jātaka dans les manuscrits Pāli de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris', BEFEO 51, 1963, pp. 79–93).

Subtitles: *gadrabhaṇapañho niṭṭhito*, Ja VI 344,9 = B VI 183,7

is missing in the manuscript; *ekūnavīsatipañho niṭṭhito*, ṇe r5 = Ja VI 345,28 = B VI 184,31; *kakaṇṭakapañho niṭṭhito*, ḥai v3 = Ja VI 347,6 = B VI 186,7; *sirikālakīṇīpañho niṭṭhito*, *nau* v5 = Ja VI 349,18 = B VI 188,16.

5b. MAHOSATHAJĀTAKAM, *phūk* 2, dated BS 2249 = 1706

Leaves: *ṭa-dai*

Beginning: *aparasmim divase . . .* : Ja VI 349,19 = B VI 188,17

End: *devatāpañho niṭṭhito*: Ja VI 378,21 = B VI 222,16

Remarks: Corrected in the same way as *phūk* 1 with additional scratched corrections.

Subtitles: *dvādasanipāte menḍakapañho niṭṭhito*, ṭū v2 = Ja VI 355,21 = B VI 194,26; *visatinipāte sirimendakapañho niṭṭhito*, ṭha v2 = JA VI 363,23 = B VI 204,9 (*sirimantapañhā*); *channapathapano niṭṭhito*, ṭhī r2 = Ja VI 366,6 = B VI 206,18; *amaradevipariyesanam niṭṭhitam*, ṭhai r3 = Ja VI 368,14 added after *anusāsi*; subtitle not in E, but = B VI 210,5 (-*pariyesanā niṭṭhitā*); *cattāro ratanacorā niṭṭhitā*, *ṭhah* r3 = Ja VI 370,13 added after *pesesi*, subtitle not in E, but cf. *sabbaratanathenā* E note 5 = B VI 213, 13; *khajjotapanakapañho niṭṭhito*, *dā* r3 = Ja VI 372,10 = B VI 215,12; *bhūripañho niṭṭhito*, *dū* r2 = Ja VI 376,5 = B VI 219,19; *devatāpañho niṭṭhito*, *dai* v5 = Ja VI 378,21 = B VI 222,16.

5c. BRAḤ MAHOSATHA, *phūk* 3, dated BS 2249 = 1706

Leaves: *ca-jau*; *caḥ* occurs twice

Beginning: *puna te cattāro . . .* : Ja VI 378,22 = B VI 222,17

End: . . . *kira mithilānagaravāsino sahiraññasuvannā jātā. mahaggharatanāni jātāni*: Ja VI 409,25 = B VI 255,3

Remarks: Corrections as in *phūk* 2; some leaves slightly damaged by worms, no text lost.

Subtitles: *pañcapāṇḍitapano niṭṭhito*, *niṭṭhitā ca paribhindakathā ti*, *caḥ* r5 = Ja VI 389,30 = B VI 234,14. B:*brahmadata-tassa yuddhaparājayaḥ* *kaṇḍam niṭṭhitam*, B VI 255,6 after . . . *vassam atītam*, Ja VI 409,26.

5d. MAHOSATHAJĀTAKAM, *phūk* 4, dated BS 2249 = 1706

Leaves: *pū-bham*

Beginning: *brahmadattassā pi . . .*: Ja VI 409,25 = B VI 255,3

End: . . . *omuñcivā ummaṅgadvāre vālukam vyūhitam katvā tathā thapesi*: Ja VI 448,2 = B VI 297,11

Remarks: No subtitles given in E; *suvanṇakhaṇḍam niṭṭhitā*, B VI 272,7 corresponding to Ja VI 425,27: missing also in our manuscript on leaf *phah* v1.

5e. MAHOSATHAJĀTAKA, *phūk* 5, dated BS 2249 = 1706

Leaves: *ma-rah*

Beginning: *thapetvā ca pana ummaṅgam pavisitvā ummaṅgam kkhacivā(?) tam nagaram pavisitvā . . .*: Ja VI 448,2 = B VI 297,11

End: *dakarakkhasapañho niṭṭhito. niṭṭhitā ca sabbaso mahāummaṅgajātakavannā. iti satthā imam dhammadesananā āharitvā saccāni pakāsetvā jātakam samodhānento "na bhikkhave idān' eva tathāgato paññavā parappavādamaddano atite aparipakke ṛñāne bodhiññānatthāya cariyam caranto pi paññavā yevā" ti vatvā imam jātakam samodhānetvā imā gāthā āha*

*senako kassapo āsi ambattho cāpi pukkusō
kāmindho kuccadanto ca devindho senadañdako
kevaṭṭo devadatto ca chalākā thulanandikā
sundari pañcālacandi ⟨ca⟩ mangalikā ca sālikā
udumbarā ditthamañgalikā vedeho kāludāyi ca
bherī uppalavaññāsi pitā suddhodano ahu
mātā āsi mahāmāyā amarā bimbasundarī
tikkhanakumāro⟨ca⟩chano canuhekkho ca rāhulo
suvo ahosi ānando sāriputto ca cuñāni
mahosatho lokanātho evam dhāretha jātakam
mahosat̄hapañditasāṭakam pañcamam niṭṭhitam, Ja VI 478,20
= B VI 333,12*

Subtitles: *mahāummaṅgam niṭṭhitam, yai v1* = Ja VI 466,18 = B VI 218,12; *ettakena ayam pañho niṭṭhito, yah v4* = Ja VI 470,9 = B VI 321,28.

6a. BHŪRIDATTAJĀTAKA, *phūk* 1, dated BS 2249 = 1706

Leaves: *la-sai*, at the end one leaf without pagination

Beginning: *yam kimci . . .*: Ja VI 157,25 = B VII 1,7

End: *ālambāyanakandam nitthitam*: Ja VI 186,17 = B VII 31,8

Remarks: The leaf without pagination at the end of this *phūk* seems to be a further indication that an older fragmentary manuscript has been completed at a later date: *phūk* 2 written in 1697 already starts with page *so*. On the other hand the preceding *phūk* now lost and replaced might have begun with page *la*.

Instead of *ālambāyanakaṇḍa* E has *kīlanakhaṇḍa* following its manuscript B, as this subtitle is missing in C^{ks}. B (1956) explicitly states that *ālambāyanakaṇḍa* is the Siamese reading.

There are corrections as in the Candakumārajātaka (see below).

Subtitles: *nagarakandam niṭṭhitam, vā r1* = Ja VI 167,27 = B VII 12,7; *uposathakandam niṭṭhitam, vi r4* = Ja VI 170,1 (not in C^{ks}) = B VII 14,5; *brāhmaṇakaṇḍam niṭṭhitam, vah v1* = Ja VI 177,14 (*vanappavesana-*, not in C^{ks}) = B VII 22,2 (B gives no subtitle, but notes: C, E *vanappavesana-*, S: *nesāda*-); . . . *pakkāmi. garuddhakaṇḍam niṭṭhitam. tasmiṁ kāle . . . , sā r1* = Ja VI 178,22 (not in E) = B VII 23,8; *somadattakandam niṭṭhitam, se r2* = Ja VI 183,27 (after verse 61, not in E) = B VII 29,2 (not in B); *silakhaṇḍi (!) niṭṭhitam, se v5* = Ja VI 184,22 = B VII 29,25 (not in B).

6b. BHŪRIDATTAJĀTAKAM, *phūk* 2, dated BS 2240 = 1697

Leaves: *so-hah, dva-dvah, a-ai*; one leaf without pagination at the end, which is covered by writing only in the middle column, recto, otherwise blank.

Beginning: *ālambānenā pana . . .*: Ja VI 186,19 = B VII 31,19

End: *bhūridatto pana aham evā ti sammāsambuddho ti. bhūridattajātakam niṭṭhitam chattha(!). nibbānapaccayo hotu. buddham saraṇam gacchā*: Ja VI 219,27 = B VII 70,7

Remarks: Critical edition and translation of verses 14–184 by L. Alsdorf ('Das Bhūridatta-Jātaka. Ein antibrahmanischer Nāga-Roman', WZKS 21, 1977, pp. 25–55).

Subtitles: . . . *agamāsi. vilāpakaṇḍam nitthitam. tasmiṁ khane . . . , hi r1* = Ja VI 191,16 = B VII 26,29 (not in E,

B); . . . nivatti. bārānasikandam nititam(!). te pi . . . , ho r3 = Ja VI 197,7 = B VII 34,16 (E = B *nagarappavesana-*, one sentence later than in our manuscript, not in C^{ks}); *subhogakandam niṭṭhitam*, hah r5 = Ja VI 200,13 = B VII 46,25 (B = E *mahāsattassa pariyesana-*, not in C^{ks}; . . . *vāñnesi*. *yañña-vādavanñanā niṭṭhitā*. *tassa tam katham* . . . , dvu r3 = Ja VI 205,19 (not in E) = B VII 53,13 (*micchākathā*); . . . *nākāsi*. *yaññabhedakanḍam niṭṭhitam*. *sāgarabrahma-datto* . . . , ū r3 = Ja VI 217,20 = B VII 67,12 (not in E, B).

7. CANDANAKUMĀRAJĀTAKA, *phūk* 1, dated BS 2240 = 1697Leaves: *o-gu*Beginning: *rājāsi luddha(!)kammo ti* . . . : Ja VI 129,19 = B VII 71,1End: . . . *suriyakumāro sāriputto*. *sakko anuruddho*. *candanakumāro pana aham evā ti sammāsambuddho*. *candanakumārajātakam sattamam niṭṭhitam*. *buddham saraṇam gacchāmi dhammam saraṇam gacchāmi*. *saṃgham saraṇam gacchāmi*. *nibbānapaccayo ho*: Ja VI 157,23 = B VII 104,24. Added in margin: *parisā buddhaparisā avahasum(!)*, to be inserted before *candanakumāro*.

Remarks: There are notes and corrections by a second hand. The manuscript is very slightly damaged by worms without any loss of text. The verses have been critically edited by L. Alsdorf ('Die Āryā-Strophen des Pāli-Kanons. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur. Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse. Jahrgang 1967 Nr. 4, Wiesbaden 1968, pp. 38–50).

8. BRAHMANĀRADAJĀTAKAM, *phūk* 1, dated BS 2240 = 1697Leaves: *gyū-caḥ* plus one leaf as in no. 6bBeginning: *ahū rājā videhānan ti* . . . : Ja VI 219,29 = B VII 105,1End: . . . *mahābrahmā bodhisatto aham eva sammāsamvud-dho(!) tha jātakan ti*. *mahānāradajātakam niṭṭhitam atṭhamam*, Ja VI 255,12 = B VII 149,29Remarks: There are frequent corrections and notes by two different hands. See P. Dupont: *La version mōne du**Nāradajātaka*. Paris 1954. (Publication de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient XXXVI).7. VIDHŪRAJĀTAKA, *phūk* 1, dated BS 2249 = 1706Leaves: *chya-ña*Beginning: *pandu kisiyāsi* . . . : Ja VI 255,14 = B VII 251,1 End: *akkhakanḍam niṭṭhitam*: Ja VI 292,3 = B VII 195,6 (E, B *lakkhana-*)Remarks: The second *phūk* of this jātaka is missing. See H. Lüders ('Das Vidhurapañditajātaka', ZDMG 99, 1945–1949, pp. 103–130 = Kleine Schriften, Wiesbaden 1973, pp. 36–66). On the verses of the Dohaļakhaṇḍa (Ja VI 262–274). L. Alsdorf ('Das Jātaka vom weisen Vidhura', WZKS 15, 1971, pp. 23–56).Subtitles: . . . *aggamamsu. catuposathapañhā niṭṭhitā*, *chyai* v5 = Ja VI 262,1 = B VII 258,24; *dohalinikanḍam niṭṭhitam*, *jyai* v2 = Ja VI 274,30 = B VII 173,27; *manikanḍam niṭṭhitam*, *jhya* v2 = Ja VI 279,32 = B VII 180,11; (no subtitle at Ja VI 286,8); *gharāvāsapāñho niṭṭhito*, *jhyo* v3 = Ja VI 287,31 = B VII 190,10.The manuscript is written carefully and has been worked upon by one, or sometimes two different hands, which have corrected the text and inserted interlinear or marginal notes here and there. Although the text closely follows the SE Asian tradition, which can be seen even at a glance from the arrangements of the *jātakas* [see G. H. Luce; 'The 550 Jātakas . . . ', and G. Martini, 'Les titres des Jātaka . . . ' as above I 5a] the tradition is not always identical with the one of the Burmese branch, although both the Burmese branch and our manuscript have many characteristic variants in common, such as Fausböll's B^d *indiyācāpadhāribhi*, Ja VI 46,28* against E *illiyačāpadhārihi* (cf. Ja VI 503,7*); *inda-khaggadharā*, Ja VI 223,18* against E *ittīhi-*; E (also B^d) *dhīrā*, Ja VI 223,19* against B, Mon, our manuscript *vīrā*. One of the characteristics of non-Burmese SE Asian Pāli seems to be the predilection for the verbal ending *-mhase* in the first person plural, e.g. *katham amhe karomhase* (ct. *karoma*), Ja VI 163,26* E = B = S *karomase*; *ganhāmhase manim tāta* (ct. *ganhāma*), Ja VI 182,13* E = B = S

gañhāmase; mā . . . kāmasā pajahāmhase (ct. *mā jahāma*), Ja VI 182,14* E = B *pajahimhase*, S *pajahāmase* (v.l. from ‘ma’: *pajahimse*(!)); *gañhamhase vikantanam* (ct. *gañhāma*) Ja VI 441,5* = 24* E *ganhāmase vikantanam*, B = S *gañhāmase vikantanam*. The use of these forms is by no means a peculiarity limited to this manuscript. Also in manuscripts from North Thailand we find, e.g. *vane yattha vasemhase*, Ja VI 516,10* = S, E = B *vasāmase*; *vademhase*, D III 197,22 E *vademase*.

The ending has been noted by W. Geiger (*Pāli Literatur und Sprache*, Strassburg 1916 §§ 122, 126). The explanation given in § 122, viz. a contamination of *-mhe*, which in turn originated by syncope from *-mahe*, and *-mase*, seems to be rather doubtful. Native grammarians teach the ending *-mhave* as belonging to *hiyyatāni*, Sadd 821,22 (cf. 842,9, where Ja III 26,18* is quoted) or to *ajjatanī*, Mogg VI 5.

Although it does not seem possible at present to trace the origin of this ending, a possible development might have started from the Middle Indic preterite ending *-mha* enlarged by *-se* as the imperative *labhāma*: *labhāmase* (Sadd 821,18), and occasionally also the indicative (Geiger § 122). Starting from examples such as *mā . . . pamādamhase*, Ja III 131,16* it could have begun to intrude also into the paradigm of the present. However in the absence of a more detailed investigation into the syntactic use of this form in particular, and into the system of verbal endings in Pāli in general, this problem cannot be solved with any certainty.

A second grammatical peculiarity, again not limited to this manuscript is: *āhuyantu suyuddhena*, Ja VI 192,12* E = B = S *avhāyantu* (E *avhay-*); *anūnanāmo iti m' āhuyanti*, Ja VI 273,13* E = B = S *avhayanti*; *āhuyant' eva gacchantaṁ*, Ja VI 529,1* E = B = S *avhayant'*. Just as the ending *-amhase* is not in general use, so this form does not replace *avhayati* everywhere. If this form is old, it is probably a remnant of the SE Asian Pāli tradition (see O. v. Hinüber, *Notes on the Pāli tradition in Burma*. Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. I. Philologisch-Historische Klasse. Jahrgang 1983 Nr. 3). A warning against this assumption, which, if correct, would suggest an explanation

of *avhayati* > *āhuyati* along the lines of H. Berger (*Zwei Probleme der mittelindischen Lautlehre*. München 1955, pp. 61 foll.), comes from the fact that Aggavaṇsa has *avhayati* (Sadd 456 no. 1000) only, and no *āhuyati* seems to be traceable either in the grammatical literature (Mogg, Rūp) or in Burmese or Sinhalese manuscripts as far as the evidence collected in the CPD allows a conclusion.

Some unusual Sanskritic writings occur in this manuscript: *pokharanyā*, Ja VI 173,27* for *pokkharaññā* or *veduriyā-* for *veluriyā-*, Ja VI 173,28*, where *d* and *đ* are confused as happens frequently in SE Asian Pāli manuscripts; *avadriyati*, Ja VI 183,2* for E = C *mahissam avadīyati* (CPD: *mahi-'ssam-avadīyati*), B *mahissam api vivarati*, which is an unmetrical correction following the commentary, S *mahim assa vindriyati*: on *avadriyati* cf. *udriyati*, on *vindriyati*, cf. *undriyati*: KZ 94, 1980, 25 foll. and Pāli Tradition in Burma, p. [11] note 19; *opupphapadmā titthanti*, Ja VI 173,27* = B = C, which is Sanskrit, though metrically correct against E = S *opupphapadumāni titthanti*, cf. *opupphāni ca padmāni*, Ja VI 497,28* E = B = S = C, where three manuscripts of the Himavantakhaṇḍa of the Vessantara-Jātaka written in Khmer script and kept in the National Library, Bangkok, have *opupphāni padumāni*, which is the older and better text (cf. O. v. Hinüber: ‘Die Entwicklung der Lautgruppen -tm-, -dm- und -sm- im Mittel- und Neuindischen’, MSS 40, 1981, pp. 61–71, esp. pp. 61 foll.). A peculiar but isolated, writing is *maṇsam*, Ja VI 334,19*.

Occasionally the manuscript shares variants with Fausböll’s C^{ks} such as *kappāsapicuraseva*, Ja VI 184,7* against E = B = S *-picurāśīva*, and sometimes the variants are even superior to the ones found in C^{ks}: *paṭicammagataṁ sallam passa vihāmi lohitam*, Ja VI 78,15* E = C against our manuscript and S *patibāmagataṁ sallam passa thimhāmi lohitam*.

Variants are *paṭivāma-* and *dhimhāmi* in B. The reading *paṭivāma-* is not only confirmed by the commentary, but also by *paṭivāmagatan ti mahārāja tayā vijjhitaṁ kandam paṭivāmagataṁ aparapassagataṁ*, Ja-pṭ quoted from Čičak-Chand, cf. manuscript II described below. In spite of *paṭivāma-*

magatan ti dakuṇu ḍālayen vidi vamālayen giyē, Ja-gp ‘piercing the right side, going to the left side,’ Fausböll’s *paticamma-* does not seem to be a misreading of similar *akṣaras*, as is confirmed by Sadd 460 note b.

The derivation of *dhimhāmi/thimhāmi* is not clear, c.f. *dhimha niṭhubane*, Sadd 460,7 quoting this passage. A possible link with *stimyati* ‘is wet’ (Dhātup., Turner 13696) would presuppose a mistake for **thimmati*, suspected also by H. Smith (Sadd 460 note c) and CPD (s.v. *anamha*). The Sinhalese *vihāmi* (– ⓘ) seems to be as obscure as *dhimhāmi*.

In the following verse the SE Asian tradition had an understanding of the text obviously different from the one preferred in Ceylon: *khattā na vessā na balīm haranti*, Ja VI 208,11* has been amended by L. Alsdorf, WZKSO 21. 1977. 44,51 to *khattāna vessāna balīm haranti*. ‘Kṣatriyas und Vaiśyas bringen Opfer dar’, which definitely is an improvement upon Fausböll’s text, and which, furthermore, makes excellent sense in a context where an ideal world is contrasted to the real one. In SE Asia, however, the verse was interpreted differently: *khatyā hi vessānam balīm haranti* B = S = our manuscript = Bangkok no. 6290/6291 written AD 1668(?) with *khattā* reshaped into *khatyā* according to considerations following the native grammarians: see O. v. Hinüber (‘Pāli as an artificial language,’ *Indologica Taurinensis* 10, 1982, pp. 133–140, esp. 138) (‘for the Kṣatriyas bring taxes to the Vaiśyas’, and not vice versa as it should be. As this also makes good sense and moreover avoids the assumption of a possible though otherwise unattested **kṣatṛiyāya* > *khattāna*, it seems to be even superior to the Sinhalese text, where the ending of the nom. pl. must be short because of the metre. This again is not an easy assumption, more difficult at least than a gen. pl. *-ānām* read *-ānā* (– ⓘ), which occurs frequently.

In the same way the variant *anubbatā*, Ja VI 473,4* common to the SE Asian tradition shared by our manuscript is better than *anuggatā* in E = C, which can be explained only by assuming a special and isolated meaning for *anu-ud-gata*, which at the same time was confused with *anugata* in this passage, as is done in the CPD. *Anubbatā* on the other

hand occurs again twice as the first word in a *ślokapāda*, and furthermore is explained by *anugata* as in the commentary on Ja III 521,10* and also on Ja VI 473,4*.

These few selected examples may be sufficient to demonstrate the value of this manuscript and to stress once again the often underestimated value of the SE Asian text tradition as a whole.

II. LINATTHAPAKĀSINĪ JĀTAKĀTĀKĀ. Library no. 6271 (old number 126-6/5); 14 fasc.; dated BS 2190 = 1647 (on *phūk* 6). Khmer script.

The covers are wooden without decoration. On both sides of the palm leaf part of the book there is a gold pattern on red paint, which continues up to the sides of the wooden book covers. On an apparently old ivory slip which is attached to the string tied around the bundle the title is given in Khmer script as follows: *Linatthappakāsinijātakatthathātikā*. 14 *phūk*.

Some *phūk* have been slightly damaged by rats without any loss of text.

1. LINATTHAPAKĀSINĪTĀKĀ JĀTAKĀ, *phūk* 1.

To the left of the title: *saddhammarājena bhikkhunā sabbañ-ñubuddhabhāvāñ patthantena idam likhapitam vipulasad-dhāya*. There are further notes by different hands apparently belonging to different times.

Leaves: *ka-khāh*.

2. LINATTHAPAKĀSINĪTĀKĀ EKANIPĀTA, *phūk* 2.

Different notes as on 1, same donor. Above the title: *ye kukkurārājakulasmiñ radḍhakāleyyakāvaññabahūpannā temenarātthamayamasmarātthanāyam saghacchādubalaggāhāni kāyanti* (reading and meaning uncertain).

Leaves: *ga-na(!)*

Colophon: *iti linnatthappakāsinijātakatthathātaya ekani-pātassa saṁvāññāna niṭhitā*.

3. LINATTHAPPAKĀSINĪTĀKĀ JĀTAKĀTĀKĀ DUK-KANIPĀTA, *phūk* 3

Notes and donor as on 1.

Leaves: *ṇa-cau*.

Colophon: *iti lina(!)ppakāsiniyā jātakaṭṭhakathāya sabbākārena dukaniptāvanṇanā niṭṭhitā*.

4. LINATTHAPPAKĀSINIJĀTAKATTHAKATHĀTIKĀ TIKKANIPĀTA-CATUKKANIPĀTA-PAÑCAKANIPĀTAPĀTA(!)-CHAKKANIPĀTA-JĀTAKA, phūk 4

Leaves: *chā-jah*, plus three leaves without pagination at the end

Colophon: *iti linatthappakāsaniyā jātakatthakathāya chakknipātavānṇanā niṭṭhitā*.

5. LINATTHAPPAKĀSINIJĀTAKATTHAKATHĀTIKĀ SATTAKANIPĀTA-AṬṬHAKANIPĀTA-NAVAKANIPĀTA-DASAKANIPĀTA-JĀTA-KASSA, phūk 5

Leaves: *jha-thu*

Colophon: *iti linā(!)tthappakāsiniyā jātakatthakathāya dasakanipāta* (end of the last line, *thu* verso; completed by a second hand: *ssa vanṇanā niṭṭhitā*).

6. LĪNATTAPPAKĀSANIJĀTAKATTHAKATHĀTIKĀ EKĀDASA-DBĀDASA-TERASA-NIPĀTA, phūk 6, dated BS 2190 pī kūn 'year of the pig'; according to Sao Saimöng (as above under I, 3) BS 2190 corresponding to CS 1009 is a *mün-gai* or pig year, *kūn* being used in Thai to designate the 12th cyclical (pig) year. Notes as on 1.

Leaves: *thū-dho*

Colophon: *sarabhajātakam*. *iti linatthappakāsiniyā jātakaṭṭhakathāya terasakanipā* (end of the last line *dho* verso).

Remarks: In the title and in the colophon the scribe wrote *linappa-*, *ttha/ṭṭha* being inserted later.

[7.] LINATTHAPPAKĀSINIJĀTAKATTHAKATHĀTIKĀ-PAKIṄNAKANIPĀTA, *ndhā* 1 (?) *paripunṇah*, notes in Thai.

Leaves: No old pagination extant; leaves 1–10, figures written by a second hand using ink, plus one leaf without pagination.

Colophon: *bhikkhāparamparājātakam niṭṭhitam*. *iti linātthappakāsiniyā jātakatthakathāya pakinṄnakaniptā niṭṭhitā*.

Remarks: No phūk number is given on the title.

8. LĪNATTHAPPAKĀSANIJĀTAKATTHAKATHĀTIKĀ VISATINIPĀ-TAJĀTAKA *ndhāta* (?) 1 *paripunṇa*, phūk 8; notes in Thai.

Leaves: *kha-khah*

Colophon: *ayogharajātakam*. *iti linātthappakāsiniyā jātakaṭṭhakathāya visatinipātavānṇanā niṭṭhitā*.

9. LINATTHAPPAKĀSINIJĀTAKATTHAKATHĀTIKĀ TISANIPĀ-TAJĀTAKA *ndhāta*(?), phūk 9; notes in Thai.

Leaves: *ga-ghe*

Colophon: *bhanḍanibhaṇḍakajātakam*. *iti linatthappakāsaniyā jātakaṭṭha-kathāya tīṣanipātassa aṭṭhavanṇanā niṭṭhitā*.

10. LĪNATTHAPPAKĀSANIJĀTAKATTHAKATHĀTIKĀ CATTĀLISANIPĀTAJĀTAKA *ndhāta*(?), phūk 10; notes in Thai.

Leaves: *ghau-ghah*, *ga-gah*, *gha-ghu*(!)

Colophon: *cūlaśuttasomajātakam*. *iti linatthappakāsiniyā jātakaṭṭhāya cattālissanipātassa vanṇanā niṭṭhitā*.

11. LĪNATTHAPPAKĀSANIJĀTAKATTHAKATHĀTIKĀ PAÑṄĀSANI-PĀTAJĀTAKA *ndhāga*(?), phūk 11; notes in Thai.

Leaves: *ṇa-ca*

Colophon: *mahābodhipariññajātakam niṭṭhitam*. *iti linātthappakāsiniyā jātakaṭṭhakathāya pañṄāsanipātavānṇanā-niṭṭhitā*.

12a. LINATTHAPPAKĀSANIJĀTAKATTHAKATHĀTIKĀ SAṬṬHINIPĀTAKA *nbāga* 2(?), added by a different hand using ink: *sattatinipāta*; notes in Thai.

Leaves: *cā-cau* (*ca* and *cha* are confused in the pagination of this phūk, e.g. *ci*, *chī*, *chu*, *cū* etc.)

Colophon: *samkiccajātakam niṭṭhitam*. *iti linatthappakāsiniyā jātakaṭṭhakathāya saṭṭhinipātassa vanṇanā niṭṭhitā*.

12b. Separated by some blank leaves from 12a; but within the same phūk: LINATTHAPPAKĀSANIJĀTAKATTHAKATHĀTIKĀ SATTATINIPĀTAJĀTAKA *ndhāga* 1(?)

Leaves: *chah-jau*

Colophon: *soṇānandajātakam niṭṭhitam*. *iti linātthappakāsaniyā jātakaṭṭhakathāya saṭṭi(ṭṭhi cancelled and replaced by ttati)nipātassa athavanṇanā niṭṭhitā*.

13. LINATTHAPPAKĀSININIJĀTAKATTHAKATHĀTĪKĀ ASITINIPĀ-TAKAJĀTAKA *pbaka*(?), *phūk* 13 *paripuṇña*, dated BS 2190 *pī kūn*; to the left of the title: *saddhamma* . . . as in 1; notes in Thai.

Leaves: *jam-thā*, *tīha* plus one leaf without pagination

Colophon: *sutasomajātakam*. *iti linatthappakāsiniyā jātaka-tīthakathāya asitinipātavaṇṇanānā(!) niṭṭhitā*.

14. LINATTHAPPAKĀSINIJĀTAKATTHAKATHĀTĪKĀ DASAJĀTī *paripuṇña*, *phūk* 14; notes in Thai.

Leaves: *thā-dhū*

Colophon: *vessantarajātakavannanā niṭṭhitā. iti linatthappakā-siniyā [taka, both cancelled]tīthajātakatīthakathāya(!) dasajā-tikassa vanṇanā niṭṭhitā*.

Previously the Linatthappakāsinī was known from a single manuscript written in Burma [CPD, Epilegomena 2.5.10,11], which was used by W. B. Bollée (*Kuṇālajātaka*, London 1970, p. XII), and by R. Čičak-Chand (*Das Sāmajātaka*, Bonn 1974, where the paragraph concerning that *jātaka* has been edited, pp. 101 foll.). Čičak-Chand states that the manuscript bristles with mistakes. In contrast to that our manuscript has been written carefully as a number of random examples from the commentary on the *dasajātimahānipāta* indicate. Comparing the passage on the Sāmajātaka with Čičak-Chand's edition, the superiority of the Thai manuscript becomes evident at once, as the meaningless *nādīm gacchā ti nādīm gacchā ti* in contrast to *nādīm gacchā ti nadīm āgaccha* in our manuscript shows.

In some places the text in each manuscript is quite different from the other. In these cases it is usually the Burmese manuscript which seems to be corrupt.

The main interest in this commentary arises from the relatively high age of the manuscript, which in the first place provides a glimpse of the text of the verses as it was read 300 years ago, as far as this can be gathered from the words quoted. The explanations themselves do not seem to offer much that is new, as the commentary draws rather heavily on the Jātakatīthavaṇṇanā. Occasionally, however, the explanations, too, are of some interest.

The following difficult verse, for instance, has been discussed briefly in the CPD s.v. *upādi*: *upādhiratham āruyha*, Ja VI 22,29*.

Here, our manuscript has *upādīti gahetvā*: as *upādhi* seems to be firmly rooted in the whole tradition including S, *d* for *dh* may be a mistake not uncommon in SE Asian Pāli manuscripts, though rarely met with in our manuscript. Strangely enough the Sinhalese tradition also knows of *upādi*: *upādi ran maravadhi* 'golden slippers' as found in Ja-gp. Here, however, the warning against false de-aspiration put forward by the Samantapāśādikā (1400,4 foll.) should be kept in mind. According to a convincing conjecture by K. R. Norman given in the CPD s.v., *upādhiratham* may be a mistaken correction of a corrupted *pādhi* to *upādhi* instead of *pānadhi* (cf. *pānadhim* at the beginning of a *śloka* in Apadāna 417,4). The reading *pānadhi[m] ratham* etc. is supported by the meaning given in Ja-gp, which takes *upādhi* and *ratha* as two words, as does Ja-pt. Although the grammatical explanation given in the latter commentary, taking *upādi* as an absolutive, may be ruled out even in the light of Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit [BHSG § 35.49 foll.], a verb is indeed lacking in this verse. The meaning assumed here seems to be inspired by *pañca rājakakudhabhaṇḍāni ganhatha* (Ja VI 23,20') or even by definitions of *upādi* as quoted in the CPD s.v. If so, this might account for the preference for *upādi* by the commentator. As this word clearly is a noun taken as a verb by the Ja-pt, this may at the same time be the first indication of a possible SE Asian origin of the Ja-pt.

The syntactical difficulties felt when reading this verse, even apart from the puzzling *upādhi/upādi*, are probably due to the somewhat careless combination of verses or parts of verses taken from different contexts and put together again mechanically, a procedure for which ample evidence has been collected by R. O. Franke, e.g. in his 'Jātaka-Mahābhārata-Parallelen' or 'Die gāthās des Vinaya-Pitaka und ihre Parallelen' (both reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*, Wiesbaden 1978).

When looking for a model for *upādhi ratham āruyha*, the

following verse suggests itself: *pamukho ratham āruhi*, S I 234,33* = 235,29* = 236,26* (*devānam pamukho seṭho ratham āruhi*, Spk I 352,27 foll.) = Ja IV 356,19* (*pamukho ti ativiya sandīṭho atha vā pubbadisam oloketvā*, Ja-pt) = Ja VI 104,17* (*uttamo abhimukho vā janassa piṭṭhim datvā ārūlho ti attho*, Ja VI 104,20'). The different explanations given by the commentaries show that the commentators did not feel sure about the meaning of *pamukho*. In the light of the numerous verses beginning with *pramukhe* in the Mahābhārata according to the Pratīka Index, in Pāli also *pamukhe* 'in front' may have been the original reading. This *pamukhe/pamukho* was changed into *pānadhi*, which was one of the paraphernalia of a king, which are enumerated in the preceding verse without the sandals at Ja VI 22,29*.

In this instance the Ja-pt offers a further proof of the difficulties caused by a textual corruption and felt as such by the traditional exegesis. In other passages the Ja-pt sometimes preserves old variants such as: *sannisinne ti saddam akatvā pakkhigane nisinne sunate vā ti saddam karontam iva* on Ja VI 507,16*. The genuine form *sunate* is preserved also elsewhere in SE Asia and has been discussed elsewhere.²⁷

These few remarks on this highly valuable manuscript may be sufficient here. An edition of the last *phūk* on the *dasajāti-mahānipāta* is planned for the near future, as is the description of further manuscripts from the rich collection of the National Library in Bangkok.

Freiburg i. Brsg.

Oskar von Hinüber

- 1 Niels Ludwig Westergaard: *Codices Indici Bibliothecae Regiae Hauniensis. Hauniae* [Copenhagen], 1846.
- 2 See *Index to the Journals of the Pali Text Society*, 1973, s.v. 'manuscripts'.
- 3 D. J. Wijayaratne: *Catalogue of the Sinhalese Manuscripts in the India Office Library*, ed. C. H. B. Reynolds, London, 1981. This contains very few Pāli manuscripts.
- 4 K. D. Somadasa: *Catalogue of Pāli-Sinhalese Buddhist Texts* (in the press).
- 5 Volume 6, No. 2, 1981–82, pp. 114 foll.: 'Catalogues of Buddhist MSS'.
- 6 A. Cabaton: *Catalogue sommaire des manuscrits sanscrits et pālis*, I, II. Paris, 1907–8.
- 7 Jacqueline Filliozat, 'État des additions au fonds pāli de la Bibliothèque Nationale', *Journal Asiatique* 1983, pp. 186–90.
- 8 Jacqueline Filliozat, 'Études récentes sur les textes pāli', *Bulletin d'Études Indiennes*. Publié par l'Association Française pour les Études Sanskrîtes, Volume 1, 1983, pp. 61–65.
- 9 G. Cœdès: *Catalogues des manuscrits en Pāli, Laotien et Siamois provenant de la Thaïlande*, 1966.
- 10 C. E. Godakumbara: *Catalogue of Ceylonese Manuscripts*, Copenhagen 1980.
- 11 C. E. Godakumbara, assisted by U Tin Lwin, with contributions by H. Bechert and H. Braun: *Catalogue of Cambodian and Burmese Pāli Manuscripts*. Copenhagen 1983.
- 12 C. Regamey, 'Manuscrits sur feuilles de palmier. Les manuscrits indiens et indochinois de la section ethnographique du Musée Historique de Berne. Catalogue descriptif', *Jahrbuch des Bernischen Historischen Museums in Bern*, 28, 1948, pp. 38–60.
- 13 H. Bechert: *Singhalesische Handschriften*. Teil I (22,1), 1969 [cf. also: H. Bechert, 'The Catalogue of Sinhala Manuscripts in Germany and the present state of cataloguing Sinhala manuscripts', *Spolia Zeylanica* 35, 1980, pp. 269–75]; H. Bechert: *Burmese Manuscripts*. Part I (23,1), 1979; K. Wenk: *Laotische Handschriften* (32), 1975. All published from Wiesbaden.
- 14 E. W. Adikaram: *Descriptive Catalogue of Pāli Manuscripts in the Adyar Library*. Madras, 1947. This collection contains only copies of the Sinhalese Pāli manuscripts prepared specially for the Adyar Library at the end of the last and the beginning of the present century.
- 15 W. A. de Silva: *Catalogue of Palm Leaf Manuscripts in the Library of the Colombo Museum*. Volume I. Colombo, 1938 (Memoirs of the Colombo Museum. Series A, No. 4).
- 16 K. D. Somadasa: *Lankāvē puskola pot nāmāvaliya*. 3 parts. Colombo, 1959–64 (cf. H. Bechert, *Spolia Zeylanica* [as in n. 13 above], p.271).
- 17 In his catalogues listed in n. 13 above. See also K. L. Janert: *Annotated Bibliography of the Catalogues of Indian Manuscripts*. Part I. Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland. Supplementband 1. Wiesbaden, 1965.

Notes

The system of abbreviations follows the Epilegomena to: V. Trenckner: *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, Vol. I, Copenhagen 1924–48 (= CPD).

Titles and colophons are transcribed from the manuscripts without correction. e.g. *jātaka* for *jātaka*, or *lināttha-* for *linattha-*.

- 18 P.-B. Lafont, 'Inventaire des manuscrits des pagodes du Laos', *BEFEO* 52, 1964–65, pp. 429–45.
- 19 L. Finot, 'Recherches sur la littérature Laotienne', *BEFEO* 17, 1917, pp. 1–218.
- 20 *Catalogue of palm leaf texts in Wat Libraries in Chiang Mai (Thailand).* Parts I–IV. 1974–75.
- 21 *A Catalogue of Lan Na Manuscripts. Microfilm Copies in the Social Research Institute*. Chiang Mai, 2525 (1982) [mimeographed], 341 pages.
- 22 O. von Hinüber, 'Pāli manuscripts of canonical texts from North Thailand', *Journal of the Siam Society* 71, 1983, pp. 75–88.
- 23 Cf. F. R. Hamm, 'Zu einigen neueren Ausgaben des Pāli-Tipitaka', *ZDMG* 112, 1962, pp. 353–78.
- 24 G. Cœdès: *The Vajirāñā National Library*. Bangkok, 1924, pp. 21–24.
- 25 Cf. L. Finot, 'S.A.R. Le Prince Damrong', *Journal Asiatique* 1930, pp. 274–79.
- 26 W. A. de Silva, *op. cit.* (in n. 15), No. 70. Unfortunately this *Sāratthappakasini* manuscript cannot be traced in the National Library at present [1984].
- 27 See O. von Hinüber, *op. cit.* (in n. 22), p. 83.

PĀLI LEXICOGRAPHICAL STUDIES III¹
TEN PĀLI ETYMOLOGIES

The task of preparing the second edition of PED² continues. Here are a few more words which are either omitted from PED, or wrongly explained there.

1. *asita* 'unattached, unfettered'

PED (s.v. *asita*²) states that the word is to be derived from Skt *aśrita*, although CPD (s.v. *a-sita*³) states that it is a cross between *aśrita* and *asita*. PED lists *sita*³ (from *sinoti* 'to bind') = 'bound' (from Skt *sita*, but it adds 'Perhaps as *sita*² [from *śrita*]'. It lists no occurrences of the uncompounded word, but gives two compounds with this derivation. It is not easy to see why some of the references given for *sita*² should not rather be under this heading.

At It 97,24* we find *asitam sabbalokassa*, glossed as *tanhādiṭṭhinissayānam pahinattā asitam kathaci anissitam* (It-a II 131,15–16), which indicates the commentator's belief in a connection with Skt *ni-śrita*. It is interesting to note that the parallel verse at G Dhp reads *asido sarvalokasya*, showing the Gāndhārī redactor's belief that the word was to be derived from Skt *asita*, not *aśrita*, which he would have written as *aśrida* or *asida*.

It cannot be stressed too much that this is *all* it shows. It is in no way *proof* that this interpretation is correct. There is evidence that in the Pāli tradition there was a commentarial tradition alongside the canon, going back in some cases to the time of the Buddha,³ although there is no way of telling whether the *a-nissita* gloss is as ancient as this. If there was a similar commentarial tradition transmitted alongside the exemplar from which the Gāndhārī redactor made his translation, then it is possible that he was relying on that when he translated in the way he did. On the other hand, if there was no such commentarial tradition, then he was likely